REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Claim for foreign priority

Applicant wishes to draw the examiner's attention to the claim for foreign priority made in the Application Data Sheet (ADS) filed with the present application, claiming priority of Taiwanese application no. 091138155, filed on December 31, 2002.

Applicant requests the examiner to acknowledge, in the next Official communication, Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the priority document which was filed on March 29, 2005.

In the claims

Claim 1 has been amended, as a matter of form and without changing the scope or meaning of the claim, to eliminate the "wherein" clause and to clearly point out that the first and second coil windings are electrically connected to said control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to said control circuit for operation of said control circuit in response to said signal, as previously set forth in the "wherein" clause.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by *Seligman* (U.S. 5,991,958). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, from which all of claims 2-14 depend, sets forth a wireless transceiver ***for providing a power supply for operation*** of an implantable device. More particularly, claim 1 recites that ***both first and second coil windings*** are electrically connected to the control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to ***supply***

electrical power to the control circuit for operation of the control circuit in response to the signal.

Moreover, the second coil is wound around its coil axis in a direction non-parallel with the direction of the first coil.

Seligman fails to anticipate the present invention because *Seligman* does not disclose or suggest first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to a control circuit.

On the contrary, *Seligman* discloses that an "external inductor 13 and an internal inductor 23 include respective ferrite cores 10, 20; a data winding 11, 21; and a power winding 12, 22. Thus, each inductor includes ***a coil specifically for data transfer***, and an ***orthogonally wound coil for power transfer***." (*Seligman*; col. 4, lines 6-10; emphasis added).

Thus, *Seligman* teaches only a single coil for power transfer, and therefore does not disclose or suggest both a first and second coil winding configured to receive a signal from an external source and to ***supply electrical power to a control circuit for operation of the control circuit*** in response to the signal.

Moreover, *Seligman* does not even disclose that a power winding is configured to supply electrical power to a control circuit for operation of the control circuit, since *Seligman* is entirely silent with regard to any connection of either the internal power winding 12 or the external power winding 22.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are all allowable over *Seligman*, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Seligman* in view of *Miller* (U.S. 5,350,413). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, *Seligman* does not disclose or suggest both first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to a control circuit.

Miller also fails to disclose or suggest first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to a control circuit, since *Miller* discloses only a single coil winding (the internal coil, "secondary coil L2"), not a first and at least one second coil winding, in which power is induced "for transformation to DC to power of a medical device." (see *Miller*; col. 2, lines 52-62).

Therefore, the combination of *Seligman* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the present invention, since even replacing *Seligman*'s single internal inductor 23 with *Miller*'s single subcutaneous winding L2 still results in only a single coil winding, not a first and at least one second coil winding, configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that *Seligman* and *Miller* fail to form a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1, and therefore claims 1-14 are all allowable over these references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Seligman* in view of *Paul et al.* (U.S. 5,697,958). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant notes that claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 each depend from claim 1. As discussed above, *Seligman* fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1, since *Seligman* does not disclose or suggest both first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to the control circuit.

It is respectfully submitted that *Paul* also fails to disclose or suggest both first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to the control circuit.

Paul, in fact, does not include any teaching or suggestion of any coil winding that is electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and ***to supply electrical power to*** the control circuit.

Paul discloses telemetry circuitry and noise detection circuitry. While in one embodiment Paul discloses "a three-dimensional coil antenna system for use in a ***noise detector*** according to the present invention" (*Paul*; col. 14, lines 35-37), *Paul* never discloses or suggests any power-supplying function of this noise detector and *Paul* never discloses or suggests plural (first and at least one second) coil windings configured to ***to supply electrical power to*** a control circuit.

Therefore, *Seligman* and *Paul*, whether considered individually or in any combination, fail to form a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1 since neither of these references discloses or suggests each and every element of claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 are allowable over these cited references at least due to their dependency from claim 1, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-14 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: 1/2/08

JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921